REMARKS

The claims have been amended better to point out applicants' invention. More particularly, claims 1 and 18 have been changed to specify that the polymeric electrolyte is formed by extrusion and that the electrolyte has a thickness between 2 and 100 μm. Changes have been made in the claims also better to conform them to US practice. New claims 19 to 21 have been added based upon preferred ranges recited in (and now stricken from) claims 5 and 13. The claims before the Examiner thus are claims 1 to 21.

The specification has been amended to recite various subsections and to indicate the chemical names of the polymers indicated by abbreviation. A full identification of the polymers has been made in claim 4.

The rejection of claims 1 to 8, 11 to 13, and 18 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Takatera et al. EP '836, if applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

The claims specify that the invention is directed to an all-solid-state electrochemical generator that includes an all-solid-state polymeric electrolyte. The specification at page 2, lines 11 to 13, discusses two types of technology, the first being an all-solid-state or "dry" technology, the second being a

plasticized or gelled technology. The claims here are directed specifically to an electrochemical generator containing an all-solid-state electrolyte, which is part of the "dry" technology mentioned in the specification. Takatera et al. EP '836, in contrast, is directed to the latter-mentioned technology, that is, a plasticized or gelled polymer electrolyte which includes a solvent. The examples in the reference clearly show the use of solvents such as propylene carbonate, ethylene carbonate, dimethyl carbonate or N-methyl pyrrolidone. The claims in the present case specifically refer to an "all-solid-state" material. The Examiner is also directed to the specification at page 2, line 15, to page 3, line 2. From a reading thereof, one understands that while it may have been obvious to add a polymer such as a fluoropolymer to a polymer electrolyte of plasticized or gelled technology, it would not have been obvious to add a fluoropolymer to a polymer electrolyte of an all-solid-state or "dry" technology used in the present invention.

Indeed, applicants point out that in the case of all-solid-state technology, the mechanical strength is provided by the macromolecular material, such as a polyether, itself. Mechanical strength is sufficient and requires no incorporation

of another polymer. Indeed incorporating a fluoropolymer can be deleterious from the standpoint of ionic conductivity.

The claims have also been amended as indicated above to state that the polymeric electrolyte is formed by extrusion and that the thickness thereof is between 2 and 100 μm. For all these reasons, the claims patentably distinguish over the reference and the rejection accordingly should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Takatera EP '836 in view of Abraham et al. '041 and the rejection of claims 14 to 17 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Takatera EP '836 in view of Padoy et al. '965 are also respectfully traversed. While applicants do not necessarily agree with the rationale expressed by the Examiner for the combination rejections, applicants respectfully point out that none of the references considered singly or in combination call for an all-solid-state material as specified in the claims. The rejections should be withdrawn also.

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging receipt of the certified copy of the priority document and for listing the references provided with an Information Disclosure Statement.

In view of the foregoing revisions and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a USPTO paper to those ends is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if additional changes are required in the case prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

July 26, 2005
Date

Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

CAW/ch
Atty Dkt: 13983.0002

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 429-6415